



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

found to lie in that we are thus enabled to forgive or pity the hero! In the same connection, Twining's interpretation of *φιλάνθρωπον* (1452. b. 38) is dismissed, a consideration which perhaps decided the retention of *στοχάζονται* (1456. a. 21) and certainly accounts for the venturesome note on p. 254. But Aristotle says *καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεὸς μὲν ἄδικος δέ, ποτ καὶ ὁ ἄδικος μὲν ἀνδρεὸς δέ.* And, finally, there is no note on *τῶν ἐν μεγάλῃ δόξῃ ὄντων καὶ εὐτυχίᾳ . . .* (1453 a. 10-11; though he stops to note the apparent contradiction in *ἡ βελτίονος* 1453 a. 16). But is there no significance in the doctrine that tragedy must be the "fall of something great"?

But when Professor Bywater deals with the text, and in the main body of the commentary, one can feel nothing but admiration for his refined, if hard-headed, sobriety. No one has so well pointed out or so carefully collected the lapses and contradictions in the *Poetics*, or so clearly shown the apparent waning of Aristotle's interest in his subject as the book goes on.

Professor Bywater frankly undertakes at the start to prove that the Arabic version is of little or no value as against the final authority of A<sup>c</sup>. The notes on 1447. a. 17 *τῷ γένει ἔτέρους* and 1448. a. 10-11, *τῷ περὶ τοὺς λόγους* are good examples of the well-known judgment which appears on nearly every page. One observes casually that Vahlen's insertion of *εἰ* before *ἔτυχεν* in 1460. b. 36, is silently passed by, and, strangely, the commentary contains no note on the singular passage *ἴξ οὖ μεταβαίνειν εἰς εὐτυχίαν . . .* (1455. b. 28).

We heartily accept his position that a translation of Aristotle should lean toward paraphrase. If somewhat bold, his version is very sure-footed where others stumble, as e.g. 1455. a. 30-31, *πιθανώτατοι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως*, where Butcher goes wrong. But one must object to "as having magnitude" in the definition of a tragedy, where the note also is defective, for the principle involved might have been illustrated at great length from Aristotle. Finally *ἀρμονία* may be equivalent to *μέλος* in 1449. b. 29, though this is doubtful, and to *τόνος* in 1449. a. 27, but it is never our English "harmony."

W. S. MILNER

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
TORONTO

*Four Plays of Menander: The Hero, Epitrepones, Periceiromene, and Samia.* Edited with Introductions, Explanatory Notes, Critical Appendix, and Bibliography, by EDWARD CAPPS. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1910. x + 329 pp.

Mr. Capps's edition of the four plays in the Cairo papyrus has a distinct individuality: the editor's liberal employment of his own supplements in the filling of lacunae, his independence in the distribution of

the dialogue and in the interpretation of the plots, the considerable increase in illustrative material in the commentary, sharply differentiate this edition from its French and German predecessors. In richness of information and suggestion it is easily superior to anything that has appeared hitherto.

The introductions are clear expositions of the action with ingenious solutions of the difficulties, suggestive sketches of the character treatment, and careful accounts of the interrelation of the fragments. Space does not permit a discussion of Mr. Capps's efforts to disentangle the plots; his ingenuity is ever of the better sort: it starts from a basis of fact; he discriminates between plausible conjecture and sound conviction.

The deviations from the papyrus, when it is legible, are fewer than in Körte's text. To be sure, the inclusion of the *recto* of the St. Petersburg fragment, in accord with the editor's theory, is an innovation, but in this case, however one may sympathize with Körte's skepticism (*Menandrea*, p. xviii), one cannot deny that Mr. Capps has sufficient warrant for incorporating the fragment in his own constitution of the text. In some of the departures from the papyrus we doubt the wisdom of the changes. In E. 53 Σύρισκ' becomes σὺ ταῦτη' on the ground that Smierines could not have known the slave's name; but we recall the shrewdness of Gripus in the *Rudens* in accepting his master as arbitrator, and wonder if Syriscus was not equally clever in choosing an acquaintance; the first act may have provided all that the audience needed to understand the situation. In E. 261 αὐτη̄ . . . <συ>νέπαιξ<ε>ν spoils the force of the passage; any necessary "reference to the girl in the case" (cf. the note) is sufficiently contained in τοιοῦτον ἔτερον (259); and what point is there in Habrotonon's mentioning her virginity (262) except to explain why *she herself* (αὐτή̄) in spite of her present condition could properly join in the frolic of the freeborn girls (συνέπαιξον)? This view, of course, involves supplying with οὐδ' ἐγὼ τότε a thought equivalent to that expressed in 262: she stammers, naturally enough, in stating the matter to Onesimus. Even in such a small matter as γεγεν<ν>ημένον (S. 398) we wish the editor had followed the papyrus rather than Van Leeuwen. In E. 4-5, the interpretation of δίκαια δὲ πάσχω as a question will startle any reader who is following the Greek and the situation; whoever expects a γάρ, in place of δέ, in the affirmative statement seems to us to be intruding the idiom of his own language. We are especially grateful for Mr. Capps's conservatism in retaining τὸ γ' ἀστικόν of the papyrus (E. 340) as hardly anybody has done since the appearance of the *princeps*; but what virtue has Croiset's punctuation? Must we avoid τὸ γ' ἀστικὸν τὸ γύναιον because of the two articles? But the meaning is not "the clever creature!" τὸ γ' ἀστικόν is in the predicate, and the two articles and the meaning are sufficiently defended by τὸ

*χρῆμα σοφώτερον ἀ θῆλεια* (Theocr. xv. 145). In E. 850 ff., as in P. 279 ff., Mr. Capps accepts a theory that the monologue reports an imaginary conversation; this is a matter of technique, but the mass of evidence in the monologues of Latin comedy is not drawn upon by the editor to confirm or to refute the theory. In the filling of lacunae Mr. Capps has been lavish: the college student will find his reading of the plays more interesting, and the teacher will be grateful. Nor are we disposed to object to the editor's very frequent preference for his own stopgaps; the preference is often justified, and in the larger gaps the supplements are sometimes ingenious, seldom (P. 885) ill-advised. In E. 122 the choice of *αὐτοῦ* is hardly supported by the reference to Kühner-Gerth, for all the examples there quoted show the possessive pronoun following the attributive modifier; if the position of the editor's *αὐτοῦ* must be defended, such Hellenistic examples as Theocr. v. 2; Herond. v. 7, vi. 41; Callim. *Hymns*, iii. 139, would serve the purpose better.

In the commentary Mr. Capps has drawn freely on Latin as well as Greek comedy for illustration, and thereby reveals not only the meaning of Menander, but the background of situation and phraseology in Plautus and Terence. We regret the frequent comment on metrical detail; Mr. White's article makes unnecessary the space devoted to this theme; if such material were condensed, Menander's style—his freedom in the collocation of words, his peculiar sentence structure—and special phases of Hellenistic usage might receive more convincing treatment. In H. 20 the interpretation of *ἡσυχῆ* is more easily understood by a comparison of Theocr. xiv, 27 (cf. 10) and other Greek examples than by the quotation of the Latin phrase in the note. In H. 31 does not *ἀπεῖδον* in the sense of "give," not "pay," need comment (cf. E. 337, S. 12–13)? On E. 60 a reference to Wackernagel *Hellenistica*, p. 23, on *οὐθένι* would be helpful. In E. 177 does *θές* mean "put down"? Does not *τὸν ἡμέτερόν σοι θῶ*; in the next verse suggest that *θές* is hardly more than *δός*? And if *θές* does = *κατάθες*, as Mr. Capps thinks, where is the evidence that the omission of *κατά* "gives to the command a peremptory tone"? Such examples as Theoc. v. 21; viii. 13, 14 (cf. 11, 12) suggest no peremptory tone. On E. 287 the editor notes: "*ὑπόθημα*: *pledge, security*, here only in this meaning, instead of *ὑποθήκη*"; but a Theran inscription of the second century B.C. (*IG*. xii. 3. 329) is worth noting (*ἐπ' ἦ[ποθέμα]τι ἀξώχρεωι*). These nouns in *-μα* are an interesting feature of Menander's vocabulary: in E. 870 on *ἄρπασμα* Mr. Capps notes that *ἄρπαγή* is the regular word; it is well to remember that there are vestiges of *ἄρπασμα* in Plato *Legg.* 906 D (where Burnet follows AO rather than L) and in Plutarch *Cato Maior*, xiii, where CV, according to Sintenis, read *ἄρπαγμα*, but other documents *ἄρπασμα*. This passage of Plutarch, also, would supply Mr. Capps with support for the meaning "kidnapping expedition," which seems better than Wilamowitz' suggestion (Körte, *Menandrea*,

p. xxv, n. 1). In E. 686 (and cf. P. 232) *ανός . . . τῷ δέει* recalls *ξηρὸν ὑπαὶ δείοντα . . . Ἰφικλῆα* (Theocr. xxiv. 61). In P. 673 *κευμένην* is supported not only by *τιθέις* (678) but by *ἔκεισθαι* (668).

Considering the enormous amount of detail the mechanical part of the book is remarkably well done. The use of "angles" to indicate the supplementary readings is a happy device for preserving an attractive page. Misprints are rare: p. 28, n. 2, "Geffken"; p. 53, n. on 29; p. 68, n. on 171, "σήμεα"; p. 72, text of 206, "ἐπιεικῶς"; p. 75, text of 224, "ἐστιν"; p. 155, n. on 38, "εὔροιτο"; p. 169, n. on 201, "ἐν καλῶς"; "complaisance" (p. 136) and "complacence" (p. 138) are waging a Franco-Roman war.

Mr. Capps has very appreciably added to his achievements in the field of the New Comedy. Sound scholarship and the teacher's practical sense have combined to make an edition of Menander that presents material of great value to scholars without impairing the usefulness of the book in the classroom. To somebody—we hardly know to whom—we are indebted for the fact that so much space has been given to the editor for the interpretation of a small amount of text; even the high price of the book can hardly cover the outlay involved. Under these circumstances the undertaking is very gratifying to all who are interested in the encouragement of such intelligent research.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*The Sea Kings of Crete.* By JAMES BAIKIE. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. 259; 32 illustrations and a map. \$2.00.

This admirable summary of recent discoveries in Crete will doubtless prove the most popular handbook on the subject. It is better written and is considerably cheaper than Professor Mosso's *The Palaces of Crete*, and its abundant illustrations render it more attractive to the layman than either of the other recent handbooks, viz., Professor Burrows' *The Discoveries in Crete* and Mr. and Mrs. Hawes's *Crete the Forerunner of Greece*. It is, moreover, written with an enthusiasm and rapidity of style that compel the reader's interest.

The first three chapters are entitled "The Legends," "The Homeric Civilization," and "Schliemann and His Work." They are very readable but occupy more space, perhaps, than can well be spared in a book on Crete which contains altogether but eleven chapters. The next two chapters on the Knossos palace describe the results of the excavations as they were obtained year by year. This chronological method together with the author's frequent quotations from Mr. Evans' narratives give to these chapters a really dramatic interest. The writer's enjoyment of the romantic side of Minoan discoveries leads him, however, to champion doubtful theories,